SWPAO Environmental Information Form

1. Project title:		
2. Contractor name and address:		
3. Contact person and phone number:		
4. Project location:		
5. Project sponsor's name and address:		
6. General plan designation:		7. Zoning:
8. Description of project: (Describe the w project, and any secondary, support, or o sheets if necessary.)		
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Br	riefly describe the project's surro	oundings:
10. Other public agencies whose approvagreement.)	al is required (e.g., permits, fina	ancing approval, o participation
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENT	TIALLY AFFECTED:	
The environmental factors checked belo impact that is a "Potentially Significant Ir		
Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology / Soilis
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Cultural Resources	Land Use / Planning

Mineral Resources	Noise	Population / Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different ones.
- 9) The analysis of each issue should identify: a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

SAMPLE QUESTION Issues:

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICSWould the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	е			
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessmen Model prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultur and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to nonagricultural use?				
(The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program in the California Resources Agency, Department of Conservation, maintains detailed maps of these and other categories of farmland.)				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?				
III. AIR QUALITYWhere available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	a 🗌			

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan or Congestion Management Plan?		
b) Violate any stationary source air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		
c) Result in a net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		
d) Create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hot spot" (primarily carbon monoxide)?		
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCESWould the project:		
a) Adversely impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, any endangered, rare, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (sections 17.11 or 17.12)?		
b) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		
c) Have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		
d) Adversely impact federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) either individually or in combination with the known or probable impacts of other activities through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		
e) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?		

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		
V. CULTURAL RESOURCESWould the project:		
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource which is either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, or a local register of historic resources?		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resources (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)?		
c) Disturb or destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILSWould the project:		
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		
iv) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		
v) Landslides?		
vi) Flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		

vii) Wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas and where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		
b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		
c) Would the project result in the loss of a unique geologic feature?		
d) Is the project located on strata or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		
e) Is the project located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property?		
f) Where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water, is the soil capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems?		
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Would the project:		
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?		
c) Reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		
d) Is the project located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		

h) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITYWould the project:		
a) Violate Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems to control?		
f) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		
g) Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:		
a) Physically divide an established community?		
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?		

X. MINERAL RESOURCESWould the project:		
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?		
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?		
XI. NOISE		
Would the project result in:		
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?		
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?		
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSINGWould the project:		
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES		
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or		

physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?		
Police protection?		
Schools?		
Parks?		
Other public facilities?		
XIV. RECREATION		
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?		
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFICWould the project:		
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?		
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?		
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --

Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e) Has the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
d) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	No Impa	
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Significant	Significant With		
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or	Significant	Significant With		
 a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, 	Significant	Significant With		